

| | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Interview Summary | Application No. 09/668,144 | Applicant(s) Williams |
| | Examiner Michael Colaianni | Group Art Unit 1731 |

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Michael Colaianni

(3) _____

(2) Paul Rivard

(4) _____

Date of Interview Nov 19, 2001

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
c) Personal [copy is given to 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No. If yes, brief description:

Claim(s) discussed: 29, 39, 46, and 55

Identification of prior art discussed:

Azumano 3937227; Wilson 3503137

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Mr. Rivard explained that the invention was directed to controlling the conditions during the "drying stage" of the curing process and not during the "coloring stage" as Azumano teaches at col. 10-11, lines 59-68, 1-5. The Examiner indicated that Azumano does teach that 20% of the moisture is removed during the "coloring stage" which constitutes "drying" according to him. The Examiner suggested that the language "by treating the tobacco plant after the yellowing stage" be inserted in the preamble of the independent claims to indicate that the process is being performed after the "coloring stage" and does not include the drying that occurs during the coloring stage. Mr. Rivard did not think that would be objectionable, but agreed to check with his client. Mr. Rivard then indicated that Wilson also does not teach avoiding anaerobic condition during the drying stage. The Examiner believes that adding the above language to the preamble will overcome the rejection pending further consideration of the Azumano and Wilson references. The 112, 2nd Paragraph issues will be corrected.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached



MICHAEL COLAIANNI
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.